

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 49-62 are pending. Claims 49-62 are amended. Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the changing of the inventorship to include Messrs. James C. Culp and Craig E. Farren.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a):

Claims 49-53 and 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murayama (USPN 5,259,745). Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama in view of Zangari et al. (USPN 4,295,436). Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama in view of Glick et al. (USPN 5,620,720). Claims 58 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama in view of Jones et al. (USPN 5,847,961). Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama in view of Glick et al. and Jones et al. Applicant overcomes the rejections as follows.

Claim 49 has been amended to affirmatively set forth “a plurality of molds and corresponding plugs, each single mold and corresponding plug representing a unique shape.” Claim 49 further sets forth a workpiece manipulator and mold and plug manipulator used to “cause a single workpiece and a single mold and corresponding plug to substantially simultaneously arrive at the workpiece operation chamber to allow the workpiece manipulator to present the single workpiece to the single mold and plug so that the single workpiece is formed into a uniquely shaped item through the cooperative engagement of the single mold and corresponding plug.” Applicant could find no disclosure of these features in Murayama.

In contrast to Claim 49, Murayama discloses a practice for providing the inside surface of the top panel of a container closure shell made of a thin metal plate or a synthetic resin with a liner that is molded from a relatively soft synthetic resin in order to impart desired excellent sealability to the container closure.

In FIGS. 3A-3F of Murayama it is disclosed that synthetic resin material 248 is forced into a required position on the inside surface of top panel 42 of the container closure shell 32 and is formed into an annular liner.

In carrying out the above molding, closure shells 32 are positioned in molding means 8 where a synthetic resin material 248 is forced through the operation of push member 124 and bushing member 126 to descend into the small-diameter lower portion 230 in the inner peripheral surface of the sleeve member 128 as shown in FIG. 3-E, and is pressed onto the peripheral region on the inside surface of top panel 42 of the container closure shell 32.

When the bushing member 126 is lowered to the lowermost position shown in FIG. 3-F, an annular liner 294 of a required shape is formed on the inside surface of top panel 42 of the container closure shell 32.

Unlike in the operation disclosed in Murayama, in Claim 49 it is set forth that the workpiece manipulator presents the single workpiece to the single mold and corresponding plug so that the single workpiece is formed into a uniquely shaped item through the cooperative engagement of the single mold and corresponding plug.

Applicant could find no teaching or suggestion in Murayama that anticipates forming a workpiece into a uniquely shaped product, but instead discloses providing a synthetic resin positioned into a closure shell so that the synthetic resin can be formed into an aligner having a shape similar to all other aligners produced by the same operation.

Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion in Murayama that anticipates that each single mold and corresponding plug represents a unique shape, but instead the aligners formed in each closure shell are created by the same disclosed components to have the same shape as every other aligner to “in order to impart desired excellent sealability to the container closure.”

Accordingly, since Murayama fails to teach or suggest Applicant’s invention as set forth in Claim 49, allowance of Claim 49 is respectfully requested.

Claim 62 has been amended to set forth features similar in scope to independent Claim 49. For the reasons above, none of these features are anticipated by Murayama or made obvious in view of Glick et al. or Jones et al. Accordingly, Claim 62 is also in condition for allowance and allowance of Claim 62 is respectfully requested.


Claims 50-61 depend from Claim 49 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 49 as well as for the novel features which they add.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, pending Claims 49-62 are in condition for allowance and allowance of the application is hereby solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at 949-955-1920 is welcomed and encouraged.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 19, 2007



Theodore P. Lopez, Reg. No. 44,881
Klein, O'Neill and Singh, LLP
43 Corporate Park Drive
Suite 204
Irvine, California 92606